



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/601,995

06/23/2003

Richard D. Dettinger

ROC920030158US1

9828

46797

7590

06/17/2009

IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

JUNG, ALLEN J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3628

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/17/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/601,995	Applicant(s) DETTINGER ET AL.	
	Examiner ALLEN J. JUNG	Art Unit 3628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37, 46-53 and 55-74 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37, 46-53 and 55-74 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is in reply to the response filed on September 29, 2008.
2. Claim 54 has been canceled.
3. Claims 1-5, 8-9, 12, 20, 37, 46, 50, 55, 59-61, 63-64, 70, and 73 have been amended.
4. Claims 1-37 and 46-53, and 55-74 are currently pending and have been examined.

Previous Claim Objections

5. Claim 59 was previously objected to because of informalities. The Examiner thanks the Applicants for the appropriate corrections, and withdraws the objection.

Previous Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. Claim 50 was previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The rejection is now withdrawn.
7. Claims 1 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The rejection is maintained. See *Response to Arguments and Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112* given below.

Previous Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. Claims 1-28 and 46-74 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. (“...these processes must positively recite the other statutory class to which it is tied... Claims 1-28 and 46-74 identify neither the apparatus performing the recited steps nor any transformation of underlying materials, and accordingly, are

Art Unit: 3628

directed to non-statutory subject matter.”) The rejection is maintained for claims 1, 3, 6-11, 46-53, 55-58, and 70-74. See *Response to Arguments and Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101* given below.

9. Claims 1 and 8 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. (“...the abstract model, as claimed, is clearly a data structure....”) The rejection is now withdrawn.
10. Claim 61 was previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. (“The claimed *abstract model, a run-time component, and a fee calculator* are all claimed to be part of the “*logical framework*,” which, as claimed, is a mere combination of a data structure and computer software instructions...”) The rejection is maintained. See *Response to Arguments and Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101* given below.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed February 12, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
12. With regard to the 35 USC §112 rejection on claims 1 and 8, the Applicant had presented the following arguments:
 - *Further, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 8 to recite "providing a fee calculator which when executed configures a computer processor to calculate, based on the fee schedules, a fee to be charged for executing physical operations." Applicants submit that the claims, as amended, are not indefinite.*

The Examiner respectfully submits that even as amended, the "methods" claimed in claims 1 and 8 are indefinite. Although the Applicant added the limitation “*providing fee calculator....*,” merely “providing” a “fee calculator” software to the data structure would still lack a clear and functional set of steps of actions to be taken by the method claims. Moreover, the Examiner notes that according to the language of the claims, claims 1 and 8 are not positively reciting the execution of

Art Unit: 3628

the "fee calculator." Rather, what is claimed is the computer software merely "provided" so that it may or may not be executed by the computer processor.

13. With regard to the 35 USC §101 rejection on claims 1, 3, 6-11, 46-53, 55-58, and 70-74, the Applicant had presented the following arguments:

- *With this response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8, 12, 46, 61, and 64 to recite "a computer processor." [...] In addition, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 8 to recite "providing a fee calculator which when executed configures a computer processor to calculate, based on the fee schedules, a fee to be charged for executing physical operations." Applicants submit that the claims, as amended, are directed to statutory subject matter.*

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner notes that – according to the language of the claims – claims 1, 3, 6-11, 46-53, 55-58, and 70-74 are not positively reciting the execution process of the "fee calculator." Rather, what is claimed is a computer software element merely "provided" so that it may or may not be executed by the computer processor. Therefore, the claims are still not directed to a statutory subject matter.

14. With regard to the 35 USC §101 rejection on claim 61, the Applicant had presented the following arguments:

- *With this response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8, 12, 46, 61, and 64 to recite "a computer processor." [...] Applicants submit that the claims, as amended, are directed to statutory subject matter.*

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Even with the addition of the limitation "when executed configures a computer processor," the claimed *abstract model, a run-time component, and a fee calculator* are all still part of the "logical framework," which, as claimed, is a mere combination of a data structure and computer software instructions. Even if the fee calculator software configures a computer processor to perform an operation, the fee calculator and the logical framework is still a set of software instructions, and hence do not constitute a structural element of a system.

Art Unit: 3628

15. With regard to the amended independent claims 1, 8, 46, 59, and 61, the Applicant had presented the following arguments:

- *Applicants submit that the claims, as amended, are not taught by Coutts. As noted above, it was agreed during the interview that this clarifying amendment should obviate the rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection with respect to claims 1, 8, 46, 59, 61, and their dependents be withdrawn.*

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As cited below in the 35 USC §103(a) rejection, Coutts does teach the newly entered limitations. With regard to the Applicant's statement about what was agreed in the interview, the Examiner respectfully notes that the discussion on 35 USC §103(a) rejection during the interview was mainly focused on possibly clarifying the language for "logical field" and "physical entities of data." The Examiner submits that there was neither a clear proposal nor a clear response with regard to adding a new limitation that reads, "*an access method which is executed to retrieve a respective physical field of the physical entities of the data.*" While the addition of this limitation does clarify the scope to a certain degree, the Examiner, after consideration and review of the Coutts references, concluded that the limitations are taught by Coutts. For reasons why Coutts teach the limitation, see the rejection below.

16. With regard to the claims 12, 29, 64, and 70, the Applicant had presented the following arguments:

- *...following the Examiner's analogy would lead to a geophysical database having a "land seismic data" field and a "marine seismic data" field. This is an incongruous result because data types such as "land seismic data" and "marine seismic data" each refer to a general collection of data. Respectfully, a general collection of seismic data simply cannot be represented in a single field. As such, a physical field is not the same as a "type of data" in Rao. Therefore, Rao does not disclose "determining field-specific fees for each of a plurality of the physical fields accessed by the operation." Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection with respect to claims 12, 29, 64 and 70, and their dependents is defective and should be withdrawn.*

Art Unit: 3628

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Applicant, in asserting that "*a general collection of seismic data simply cannot be represented in a single field*," appears to argue that the claimed term "field" has a specific definition or a specific scope. The Examiner respectfully submits that there is no special meaning attached to the term "field" in the original specification. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would have interpreted the term "field" without having a certain data size in mind.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

17. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

18. Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 and 8 claim a method of providing an *abstract model*, while *the abstract model* is a data structure. Furthermore, merely "providing" a "fee calculator" software to that data structure would still lack a clear and functional set of steps of actions to be taken by the method claims. The Examiner also notes that according to the language of the claims, claims 1 and 8 are not positively reciting the execution of the "fee calculator." Rather, what is claimed is the computer software merely "provided" so that it may or may not be executed by the computer processor.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

19. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 3628

20. Claims 1, 3, 6-11, 46-53, 55-58, and 70-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 3, 6-11, 46-53, 55-58, and 70-74 are directed to a series of steps. In order for a series of steps to be considered a proper process under § 101, a claimed process must either: (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials). *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972). Thus, to qualify as patent eligible, these processes must positively recite the other statutory class to which it is tied (e.g., by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps), or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed (e.g., by identifying the product or material that is changed to a different state). Claims 1, 3, 6-11, 46-53, 55-58, and 70-74 identify neither the apparatus performing the recited steps nor any transformation of underlying materials, and accordingly, are directed to non-statutory subject matter.
21. Claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claimed *abstract model, a run-time component, and a fee calculator* are all claimed to be part of the "*logical framework*," which, as claimed, is a mere combination of a data structure and computer software instructions. The Examiner notes that the claimed "*logical framework*" by itself is not in any of the following statutory categories: a process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any improvement thereof. The Examiner also notes that given the fact that this claim is directed to a system, software instructions and data structures, as claimed, cannot be seen as a structural component of the system device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

22. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious

Art Unit: 3628

at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

23. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

24. Claims 1-37, 46-50 and 55-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coutts et al (US 2002/0073066 A1), in view of Rao et al (US 2003/0110087 A1).

Claims 1 and 8:

Coutts, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- *providing an abstract model for logically defining abstract operations to access the data, the abstract model comprising: a plurality of logical fields; (See at least ¶0020-¶0022, ¶0029)*
- *(the abstract model comprising:) a mapping rule for each of the plurality of logical fields, which map the plurality of logical fields to physical entities of the data; (See at least ¶0029)*
- *Wherein each mapping rule comprises an access method which is executed to retrieve a respective physical field of the physical entities of the data (See at least ¶0037-¶0038)*
- *(the abstract model comprising:) a fee schedule for each of the plurality of logical fields, (See at least ¶0029, ¶0038, and ¶0124)*
- *Providing a fee calculator which when executed configures a computer processor to calculate, based on the fee schedules, a fee to be charged for executing physical operations (See at least ¶0038 and ¶0120)*

With regard to the first limitation listed above, Coutts discloses, in at least the paragraphs cited, that "a third party is charged a fee for accessing data accounts."

With regard to the second limitation, Coutts discloses, in at least ¶0029, that "each data account includes data associated with an individual and access rights selected by an individual."

With regard to the third limitation, Coutts teaches an "access method" by disclosing that there is a "business agent" involved in accessing the data related to each data account. When Coutts discloses that "the business agent may then interact with the broker agent and/or directly with one or more consumer agents" in the process of acquiring data, Coutts is teaching that the mapping rule between the data accounts and the associated data involve this access method involving business agents, broker agents, and consumer agents.

With regard to the fourth limitation, Coutts discloses that "a third party is charged a fee for accessing data accounts." Coutts also discloses that such access could incur a payment of "a fee per query."

With regard to the fifth limitation, Coutts discloses, in at least ¶0038 and ¶0120, that fee is charged in bringing the accessed information to the user. With specific regard to the "fee calculator," Coutts does not explicitly disclose that there is *calculation* of the fee being done before charging the fee. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that fees would be *calculated* before being presented to the user as the amount being charged, because accessing of multiple data accounts through multiple queries could be involved in Coutts' operation, in which case the total fee could be a combination of a plurality of smaller fees.

Coutts does not explicitly disclose the following limitations:

- *wherein each fee schedule for a given logical field defines a fee to be charged when the given logical field is involved in an abstract operation to access a physical entity corresponding to the given logical field. (See at least ¶0028 and ¶0071)*

Coutts does not explicitly disclose that such fee schedule is set up in such a way that "each fee schedule for a given logical field defines a fee to be charged." However, Rao discloses that "pricing structures can include different prices for access to different types of data," clearly

Art Unit: 3628

teaching that as a subscriber accesses different data of different types, each type of data would incur its own corresponding fee in order to form the overall price to be charged to the subscriber.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Coutts' data access service, with the pricing structure as taught by Rao. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per claim 8, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 1. Accordingly, claim 8 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 1, as described above.

Claims 12 and 29:

Coutts, as shown, discloses the following limitations::

- *receiving instructions to perform an operation for accessing the data;* (See at least ¶¶0020-¶¶0022, ¶¶0029, and ¶¶0037)
- *performing the operation;* (See at least ¶¶0029, ¶¶0038, and ¶¶0124)

With regard to the first and second limitations listed above, Coutts discloses, in at least the paragraphs cited, that a third party could access data accounts in exchange for payment of certain fees,

Coutts does not explicitly disclose the following limitations. However, Rao, as shown, does:

- *determining field-specific fees for each of a plurality of the physical fields accessed by the operation;* (See at least ¶¶0028 and ¶¶0071)
- *calculating, by operation of a computer processor, a total fee to be charged to a user for the operation* (See at least ¶¶0028 and ¶¶0071)

Coutts does not explicitly disclose that such fee schedule is set up as a summed total of "*field-specific fees*." However, Rao discloses that "pricing structures can include different prices for access to different types of data," clearly teaching that as a subscriber accesses different data of

Art Unit: 3628

different types, each type of data would incur its own corresponding fee in order to form the overall price to be charged to the subscriber.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Coutts' data access service, with the pricing structure as taught by Rao. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per claim 29, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 12. Accordingly, claim 29 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 12, as described above.

Claim 46:

Coutts, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- *providing an abstract model for defining abstract operation specifications logically describing operations to access the data, the abstract model comprising: (a) a plurality of logical fields; (See at least ¶0020-¶0022, ¶0029)*
- *(the abstract model comprising:) (b) a mapping rule for each of the plurality of logical fields, which map each of the plurality of logical fields to at least one of the physical entities of the data; (See at least ¶0029)*
- *Wherein each mapping rule comprises an access method which is executed to retrieve a respective physical field of the physical entities of the data (See at least ¶0037-¶0038)*
- *(the abstract model comprising:) (c) a plurality of model entity definitions, each comprising at least one logical field corresponding to a physical field of a physical entity; (See at least ¶0029)*
- *and providing a run-time component to transform, according to the abstract model, abstract operation specifications into physical operation specifications consistent with the physical data, wherein each abstract operation specification includes at least one user-*

selected model entity definitions of the plurality of model entity definitions. (See at least ¶0029 and ¶0114-¶0120)

- *Providing a fee calculator which when executed configures a computer processor to calculate, based on the fee schedules, a fee to be charged for executing physical operations* (See at least ¶0038 and ¶0120)

With regard to the first limitation listed above, Coutts discloses, in at least the paragraphs cited, that “a third party is charged a fee for accessing data accounts.”

With regard to the second and fourth limitations, Coutts discloses, in at least ¶0029, that “each data account includes data associated with an individual and access rights selected by an individual.” Here, the identifications of the data accounts are functionally equivalent to the “*model entity definitions*.”

With regard to the third limitation, Coutts teaches an “access method” by disclosing that there is a “business agent” involved in accessing the data related to each data account. When Coutts discloses that “the business agent may then interact with the broker agent and/or directly with one or more consumer agents” in the process of acquiring data, Coutts is teaching that the mapping rule between the data accounts and the associated data involve this access method involving business agents, broker agents, and consumer agents.

With regard to the fifth limitation, Coutts discloses that “each data account includes data associated with an individual and access rights selected by the individual.” Here, Coutts teaches that each data account has an associated data, which functionally equates to “physical data.”

With regard to “*abstract operation specifications*” and “*physical operation specifications*,” Coutts teaches a “data sales interface” which is for “allowing a third party to query preselected data accounts; whereby a third party is charged a fee for accessing data accounts.” Here, the third party’s query for the data accounts is functionally equivalent to the *abstract operation specifications*, and the subsequent physical access to the corresponding data is functionally equivalent to the *physical operation specifications*.

Art Unit: 3628

With regard to the sixth limitation, Coutts discloses, in at least ¶0038 and ¶0120, that fee is charged in bringing the accessed information to the user. With specific regard to the “*fee calculator*,” Coutts does not explicitly disclose that there is *calculation* of the fee being done before charging the fee. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that fees would be *calculated* before being presented to the user as the amount being charged, because accessing of multiple data accounts through multiple queries could be involved in Coutts’ operation, in which case the total fee could be a combination of a plurality of smaller fees. Coutts does not explicitly disclose the following limitations:

Coutts does not explicitly disclose the following limitation. However, Rao, as shown, does:

- *(the abstract model comprising:) (d) model entity fee schedules for each of the plurality of model entity definitions, wherein the fee schedules each specify a fee for accessing a physical field of the corresponding model entity definition; (See at least ¶0028 and ¶0071)*

Coutts does not explicitly disclose that such fee schedule is set up in such a way that “*each of the plurality of model entity definitions*” specifies an individual fee. However, Rao discloses that “pricing structures can include different prices for access to different types of data,” clearly teaching that as a subscriber accesses different data of different types, each type of data would incur its own corresponding fee in order to form the overall price to be charged to the subscriber.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Coutts’ data access service, with the pricing structure as taught by Rao. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Claims 59 and 61:

Coutts, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- *an abstract model for defining abstract queries logically describing operations to query the data, the abstract model comprising: (i) a plurality of logical fields; (See at least ¶¶0020-¶¶0022, ¶¶0029)*
- *(the abstract model comprising:)(ii) a mapping rule for each of the plurality of logical fields, which map the plurality of logical fields to physical entities of the data; (See at least ¶¶0029)*
- *Wherein each mapping rule comprises an access method which is executed to retrieve a respective physical field of the physical entities of the data (See at least ¶¶0037-¶¶0038)*
- *a run-time component configured with transformation instructions to transform an abstract query, comprising logical fields selected from the plurality of logical fields, into a physical query consistent with the physical data; and a fee calculator configured to calculate a fee for executing physical queries based on the fee schedules. (See at least ¶¶0029, ¶¶0037-¶¶0038, and ¶¶0114-¶¶0120)*

With regard to the first limitation listed above, Coutts discloses, in at least the paragraphs cited, that “a third party is charged a fee for accessing data accounts.”

With regard to the second limitation, Coutts discloses, in at least ¶¶0029, that “each data account includes data associated with an individual and access rights selected by an individual.”

With regard to the third limitation, Coutts teaches an “access method” by disclosing that there is a “business agent” involved in accessing the data related to each data account. When Coutts discloses that “the business agent may then interact with the broker agent and/or directly with one or more consumer agents” in the process of acquiring data, Coutts is teaching that the mapping rule between the data accounts and the associated data involve this access method involving business agents, broker agents, and consumer agents.

With regard to the fourth limitation, Coutts discloses that “A third party may have its own agent (hereinafter referred to as a business agent) so that the third party can instruct the broker agent about the number and type of individuals that the third party would like to query. The business

Art Unit: 3628

agent may then interact with the broker agent,” (See at least ¶¶0037-¶¶0038) and the broker agent would then retrieve the physical data and forward the data to the third party (See at least ¶¶0120).

Coutts further discloses, in at least ¶¶0038 and ¶¶0120, that fee is charged in bringing the accessed information to the user. With specific regard to the “*fee calculator*,” Coutts does not explicitly disclose that there is *calculation* of the fee being done before charging the fee. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that fees would be *calculated* before being presented to the user as the amount being charged, because accessing of multiple data accounts through multiple queries could be involved in Coutts’ operation, in which case the total fee could be a combination of a plurality of smaller fees.

Coutts does not explicitly disclose the following limitation. However, Rao, as shown, does:

- *(the abstract model comprising:)(iii) a fee schedule for each of the plurality of logical fields;* (See at least ¶¶0028 and ¶¶0071)

Coutts does not explicitly disclose that such fee schedule is set up in such a way that “*each of the plurality of logical fields*” specifies an individual fee that may add up to the total fee. However, Rao discloses that “pricing structures can include different prices for access to different types of data,” clearly teaching that as a subscriber accesses different data of different types, each type of data would incur its own corresponding fee in order to form the overall price to be charged to the subscriber.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Coutts’ data access service, with the pricing structure as taught by Rao. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per claim 61, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 59. Accordingly, claim 61 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 59, as described above.

Claims 64 and 70:

Coutts, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- *receiving, via a user interface, user input comprising instructions for an operation for accessing the data selected fields of the plurality of the physical fields;* (See at least ¶0029 and ¶0117)
- *calculating, by a computer processor, a fee to be charged to a user for accessing the selected fields;* (See at least ¶0038 and ¶0120)
- *displaying the fee to the user via a user interface.* (See at least ¶0120)

With regard to the first limitation listed above, Coutts discloses, in at least ¶0029 and ¶0117, that a data sales interface is provided, and discusses an example of insurance company querying for various customer data via the data sales interface. In the example provided in at least ¶0117, Coutts discloses that such request and input could be done via web browser's interface.

With regard to the second and third limitations above, Coutts discloses, in at least the paragraphs cited, that that "Business agents may pay a fee per query posed so that if they want to find out further information they must pay a further fee." Coutts also discloses, in at least ¶0120, that the broker would provide the insurance company "with a charge for fulfilling the request." One skilled in the art would recognize that if payment is done on a per-query basis and additional query incurs further charging of fees, there is a "*calculating a fee to be charged*" clearly involved in order to charge the users all "query fees" and "further fees" incurred. With regard to the limitation "*displaying the fee to the user via a user interface,*" Coutts, in at least ¶0120, discloses that such providing of "a charge for fulfilling the request" could be done "via the company's Web browser."

Coutts does not explicitly disclose the following limitation. However, Rao, as shown, does:

- *determining field-specific fees for each of the selected fields;* (See at least ¶0028 and ¶0071)

Coutts does not explicitly disclose that such fee schedule is set up as "*field-specific fees for each of the selected fields.*" However, Rao discloses that "pricing structures can include different prices for access to different types of data," clearly teaching that as a subscriber accesses different data

Art Unit: 3628

of different types, each type of data would incur its own corresponding fee in order to form the overall price to be charged to the subscriber.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Coutts' data access service, with the pricing structure as taught by Rao. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per claim 70, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 64. Accordingly, claim 70 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 64, as described above.

Claims 2, 16-17, 19, 23, 27, 33-34, 36, 49, 56-57, 67-68, and 72:

Coutts discloses the limitations of claim 1, which claim 2 depends upon. Coutts, as shown, also discloses the following limitation:

- *accessing the data according to an abstract operation comprising at least two of the plurality of logical fields; (See at least ¶¶0116-¶0117)*

Coutts discloses, in the example disclosed in at least ¶¶0116-¶0117, that there could be multiple (e.g. five hundred) data accounts that the third party could query.

Coutts does not specifically disclose the following limitations. However, Rao, as shown, does:

- *calculating, by executing the fee calculator, the fee to be charged based on separate fee schedules corresponding to each of the at least two plurality of logical fields. (See at least ¶¶0028 and ¶0071)*

While Coutts does not explicitly disclose that fee is generated according to *separate fee schedules corresponding to each of the at least two plurality of logical fields*, Rao, in at least ¶¶0028 and ¶0071, does. In at least ¶¶0028, Rao discloses "establishing a plurality of subscriptions to the geophysical database, each of the plurality of subscriptions including a respective fee for which a respective subscriber is provided access to the geophysical data." Rao further discloses, in at least ¶0071, that "pricing structures can include different prices for access to different types

Art Unit: 3628

of data,” clearly teaching that as a subscriber accesses different data of different types, each type of data would incur its own corresponding fee in order to form the overall price to be charged to the subscriber.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Coutts’ data access service, with the pricing structure as taught by Rao. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per claims 16-17, 19, 23, 27, 33-34, 36, 49, 56-57, 67-68, and 72, these claims encompass substantially the same scope as claim 2. Accordingly, claims 4, 16-17, 19, 23, 27, 33-34, 36, 49, 56-57, 67-68, and 72 are rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 2, as described above.

Claims 3:

Coutts, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- *providing a run-time component configured with transformation instructions to transform each abstract operation, comprising logical fields selected from the plurality of logical fields, into a physical operation consistent with the physical data* (See at least ¶0029, ¶0037-¶0038, and ¶0114-¶0120)

Coutts discloses that “A third party may have its own agent (hereinafter referred to as a business agent) so that the third party can instruct the broker agent about the number and type of individuals that the third party would like to query. The business agent may then interact with the broker agent,” (See at least ¶0037-¶0038) and the broker agent would then retrieve the physical data and forward the data to the third party (See at least ¶0120).

Claims 9, 22, and 24:

Coutts, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

Art Unit: 3628

- *transforming, according to the abstract model, abstract operation specifications into physical operation specifications consistent with the physical data, wherein each abstract operation specification includes at least one of the plurality of model entity definitions;* (See at least ¶¶0037-¶¶0038, and ¶¶0120)
- *calculating, by executing the fee calculator, the fee to be charged for executing physical operations based on the fee schedules* (See at least ¶¶0038 and ¶¶0120)

With regard to the first limitation above, Coutts discloses that “A third party may have its own agent (hereinafter referred to as a business agent) so that the third party can instruct the broker agent about the number and type of individuals that the third party would like to query. The business agent may then interact with the broker agent,” (See at least ¶¶0037-¶¶0038) and the broker agent would then retrieve the physical data and forward the data to the third party (See at least ¶¶0120).

With regard to the second limitation above, Coutts discloses, in at least ¶¶0038 and ¶¶0120, that fee is charged in bringing the accessed information to the user. With specific regard to the “*fee calculator*,” Coutts does not explicitly disclose that there is *calculation* of the fee being done before charging the fee. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that fees would be *calculated* before being presented to the user as the amount being charged, because accessing of multiple data accounts through multiple queries could be involved in Coutts’ operation, in which case the total fee could be a combination of a plurality of smaller fees. As per claims 22 and 24, these claims encompass substantially the same scope as claim 9. Accordingly, claims 22 and 24 are rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 9, as described above.

Claims 4, 15, 21, 25, 32, 62, 66, 71, and 74:

Coutts, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

Art Unit: 3628

- *determining a per request fee for a first one of the at least two logical fields, wherein the per request fee is charged for each abstract operation involving the first one of the at least two logical fields; (See at least ¶0037-¶0038)*
- *and determining a per item fee for a second one of the at least two logical fields, wherein the per item fee is charged for each instance of the second one of the at least two logical fields involved in a given abstract operation. (See at least ¶0037-¶0038)*

With regard to the first limitation listed above, Coutts discloses that “business agents may pay a fee per query posed so that if they want to find out further information they must pay a further fee, rather than being able to acquire their own copy of the data on which they could execute multiple queries free of charge.” Here, Coutts is teaching that for each accessing operation which involves certain data accounts, the business agents may have to pay a fee on a per-request (per-query) basis.

With regard to the second limitation listed above, Coutts teaches the “*per item fee*” through the same disclosure (“business agents may pay a fee per query posed so that if they want to find out further information they must pay a further fee, rather than being able to acquire their own copy of the data on which they could execute multiple queries free of charge.”) The Examiner notes that Coutts teaches the “*per item fee*” because through the disclosure (i.e. “if they want to find out further information they must pay a further fee, rather than being able to acquire their own copy”), because Coutts teaches that they would allow only one instance of data access in each query. Hence, in Coutts' case, *per item fee* of a data account is actually equivalent to the *per request fee* of a data account.

Coutts does not teach the following limitation. However, Rao, as shown, does:

- *accessing a corresponding fee schedule for each of the at least two logical fields; (See at least ¶0028 and ¶0071)*

While Coutts does not explicitly disclose that fee is generated according to *corresponding fee schedule for each of the at least two logical fields*, Rao, in at least ¶0028 and ¶0071, does. In at least ¶0028, Rao discloses “establishing a plurality of subscriptions to the geophysical database,

Art Unit: 3628

each of the plurality of subscriptions including a respective fee for which a respective subscriber is provided access to the geophysical data.” Rao further discloses, in at least ¶0071, that “pricing structures can include different prices for access to different types of data,” clearly teaching that as a subscriber accesses different data of different types, each type of data would incur its own corresponding fee in order to form the overall price to be charged to the subscriber.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Coutts’ data access service, with the pricing structure as taught by Rao. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per claims 15, 21, 25, 32, 62, 66, 71, and 74, these claims encompass substantially the same scope as claim 4. Accordingly, claims 15, 21, 25, 32, 62, 66, 71, and 74 are rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 4, as described above.

Claims 5 and 26:

Coutts teaches some limitations of claim 4, which claim 5 depends upon. Coutts does not specifically disclose the following limitations. However, Rao, as shown, does:

- *multiplying the per item fee by a number of instances of the second one of the at least two logical fields to determine a product, and summing the product and the per request fee to determine the fee to be charged.* (See at least ¶0019-¶0020 and ¶0070)

Rao, in at least ¶0019, discloses that “access to geophysical data is typically sold on a ‘per shoot’ basis. That is, an E&P company must buy individual access to every shoot of interest.”

Rao does not specifically disclose that such “per shoot” basis pricing is done via *multiplying the per item fee and summing the product* to the subscription fee, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to do so. One would be motivated to find it obvious, because Rao discloses in at least ¶0070 that “in the prior art a subscriber must typically purchase multiple licenses to access multiple shoots.” In the case that a plurality of those shoots are in the same

Art Unit: 3628

level of tiered access (See at least ¶0019 and ¶0070), purchasing multiple licenses for those accesses would result in a payment of *multiplied* product added to existing subscription fees such as broker fees.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Coutts' data access service, with the pricing structure as taught by Rao. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per claim 26, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 5. Accordingly, claim 26 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 5, as described above.

Claims 6-7, 10, 11, 14, 18, 28, 31, 35, 48, 58, and 69:

Coutts, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- *(claim 6) at least one fee schedule defined by the abstract model specifies a first fee for a first type of operation and a second fee for a second type of operation; and further comprising calculating the fee to be charged based on the type of operation performed* (See at least ¶0028-¶0030)
- *(claim 7) the first type of operation is a query and the second type of operation is one of an insert and an update.* (See at least ¶0028-¶0030)

Coutts discloses, in at least ¶0028, that the system provides multiple services such as data warehousing (updating and storing) service and data sales (data brokerage) service. According to Coutts, both services have associated fees.

As per claims 10, 11, 14, 18, 28, 31, 35, 48, 58, and 69, these claims encompass substantially the same scope as claims 6-7. Accordingly, claims 10, 11, 14, 18, 28, 31, 35, 48, 58, and 69 are rejected in substantially the same manner as claims 6-7, as described above.

Claims 13, 30, 47, and 65:

Coutts, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- *the physical entities are database tables* (See at least Figs 4A-4C, and ¶¶0087-¶¶0088)

As per claims 30, 47, and 65, these claims encompass substantially the same scope as claim 13. Accordingly, claims 30, 47, and 65 are rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 13, as described above.

Claims 20, 37, 55, 60, 63, and 73:

Coutts, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- *each mapping rule comprises an access method for each logical field of an abstract operation specification logically defining the operation accessing the data, and wherein each logical field describes a physical location of a physical entity* (See at least Figs 4A-4C, and ¶¶0120)

Coutts discloses, in at least ¶¶0120, an example of fulfillment of a query request, in which “the broker routine 76 queries the DBMS 22 to obtain the information requested, and forwards the results of the query to the insurance company's Web browser.” Here, the broker routine 76 performs a query with the input parameters, and retrieves the rest of the data that are associated with each of the parameters. Although Coutts does not explicitly disclose that in this querying/accessing process there is *an access method describing a physical location of a physical entity*, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that when a query software finds a data account with a matching parameter, the query software would then be directed to the location of the rest of the data account (e.g. the database table's entire row that has the input parameter). One would be motivated to find it obvious, because in retrieving an associated data from a memory, one could efficiently do so by being directed to such data's memory location.

As per claims 37, 55, 60, 63, and 73, these claims encompass substantially the same scope as claim 20. Accordingly, claims 37, 55, 60, 63, and 73 are rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 20, as described above.

Claim 50:

Coutts, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- *receiving, via a user interface, the abstract query comprising a plurality of query conditions, result fields and a selection of one of the model entity definitions; (See at least ¶¶0117-¶0120)*
- *accessing the model entity definition corresponding to the selection; (See at least ¶¶0117-¶0120)*
- *determining whether the model entity definition corresponding to the selection specifies one or more required result fields; (See at least ¶¶0117-¶0120)*
- *adding the one or more required result fields to the query upon determining that the model entity definition corresponding to the selection specifies one or more required result fields. (See at least ¶¶0117-¶0120)*

Coutts discloses, in at least ¶¶0117-¶0120, that a query would take acceptance criteria such as information relating to people having selected parameters. The selected parameter being input (e.g. gender and age) is functionally equivalent to the “*result fields*.” The query also comprises a specification for pool of data accounts to query from (e.g. people living in large cities), which is functionally equivalent to *selections of one of the model entity definitions*. In the example disclosed in ¶¶0117-¶0120, the required gender and age (e.g. male aged between 23 and 30) is functionally equivalent to “*required result fields*.” Coutts teaches that the query would access the pool of data accounts, and the data accounts that specify the *required result fields* are added to the query’s results.

25. Claims 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coutts, in view of Rao, and further in view of Lyons et al (US 4,989,141).

Claims 51-53:

Art Unit: 3628

Coutts discloses the limitations of claim 46, which claim 51 depends upon. Coutts does not specifically disclose the following limitations. However, Lyons, as shown, does:

- *transforming, by the run-time component transforms and according to the abstract model, a single abstract operation specification into at least two separate physical operation specifications consistent with the physical data, wherein each physical operation specification modifies a different physical entity of the data and wherein each physical operation specifications is ordered for execution according to a physical entity relationships specification defining hierarchical relationships between the physical entities of the data.* (See at least col3:lines5-10)

Lyons, in at least the lines cited above, discloses that “the system allows for hierarchical mapping... therefore, when data is input into the data base so as to update an entry, all entities which are attached to the updated entity are also updated.”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Coutts/Rao combination's data access service, with the database updating scheme as taught by Lyons. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per claims 52-53, these claims encompass substantially the same scope as claim 51. Accordingly, claims 52-53 are rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 51, as described above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the

Art Unit: 3628

mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to **Allen J. Jung** whose telephone number is **571.270.3919**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **JOHN W. HAYES** can be reached at **571.272.6708**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair> <<http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866.217.9197** (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to **571-273-8300**.

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the **United States Patent and Trademark Office Customer Service Window**:

Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314.

June 15, 2009

/Allen J Jung/ Examiner, Art Unit 3628

/John W Hayes/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628